DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 844 HE 002 781

AUTHOR Pifer, Alan
TITLE Women in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 29 Nov 71
NOTE 45p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Civil Rights; Employment Opportunities; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Feminism; *Higher Education; *Women Professors; Working Women

ABSTRACT

Women have traditionally been discriminated against in higher education in both the attainment of degrees and in employment after earning degrees. It has been felt that women are not as capable, reliable, or effective as men in administrative and classroom situations. Statistics show that even at the present time women are underemployed and underpaid as compared with male counterparts. It has gotten to the point that, because of virtual brainwashing from birth, women themselves believe in their innate inferiority and subject themselves to traditional roles of school teachers, secretaries, or housewives. It is time for a change in not only the educational system, but also in the thought patterns of society as a whole. Women who have the ability and desire for careers in education and the professions should be given a fair chance to have them. And that fair chance, because of the accumulated negative impact of our cultural heritage, includes active encouragement and assistance to women. (HS)

ED 058844

WOMEN IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Speech by Alan Pifer
President, Carnegie Corporation of New York
Before the Southern Association of Colleges
and Schools, Miami, Florida
November 29, 1971

I am sure it was rash of me to pick the topic of women in higher education to speak to you about this evening. The subject is so highly charged with emotion these days that anyone who has the temerity to tackle it is likely to end up offending everyone and pleasing no one.

Nevertheless, it is an important subject and one which badly needs calm, objective consideration. Perhaps as one friendly to higher education but not directly involved in it I can give it that kind of treatment. Beyond those credentials I claim no special qualification to speak on the topic, except association with a foundation which has a long record of support for programs concerned with the continuing education of women.

HE 002781

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Clearly, higher education is very much on the defensive right now over the question of discrimination against women. Militant women's groups have arisen both nationally and locally on many campuses that are bringing charges against particular institutions. All levels of government have become involved in the controversy, especially the federal government.

Many men are bewildered by the suddenness with which the issue has arisen and find themselves rather offended at standing accused of an injustice they do not feel they have committed. They would like to think the commotion is all the work of a few troublemakers and will soon go away. But it is not going to go away because it is part of a general drive today for equality of women that has a potent combination of moral and political force behind it. Even the Supreme Court, by unanimous decision, has now entered the fray by applying, in a recent Idaho

case, the equal protection powers of the Fourteenth Amendment to the defense of women's rights.

The Present Situation

It isn't difficult to document the fact that American women today are not participating in higher education or enjoying its benefits to nearly the degree that they should. I won't burden you with too many details, but let me give you a few, with the caveat that the situation is changing and up-to-date statistics are hard to come by.

Although a greater proportion of girls than boys completes secondary education, only about 50 percent of the girls go on to college, as against 80 percent of the boys. Various studies show that between 75 and 90 percent of the well-qualified students who do not go on to higher education are women.

CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK
437 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10022

MEMORANDUM

DATE December 28, 1971

TO AP

FROM SB

SUBJECT The Number of Women School District Superintendents

(Referred to in Speech on Women in Higher Education)

According to several different sources at the National Education Association, the statement that there are 2 female school district superintendents out of 13,000 was obtained from a May 1970 press release reporting the testimony of Stanley J. MacFarland, assistant secretary for legislation and federal relations of the NEA. Both Edith Green and Earl Funderburk used this source, and Mrs. Green's reference to 4 women out of 13,000 appears to be a misquote.

Jack Olson of the Department of Governmental Relations at the NEA says the statistic was compiled from a survey conducted by Bill Elena, a researcher at NEA. It represents the number of women who were school district superintendents with administrative powers over operating schools during the 1967-68 school year. Aside from the obvious obsolescence of this particular figure, there are several factors which tend to undermine the credibility of any such figure if its limits aren't clearly defined.

--The NEA findings don't take into account the many county superintendents, especially prevalent in rural areas of the Mid-West, who perform nothing more than clerical duties. These county superintendents may or may not be elected officials, but in any case, they don't have executive duties. A number of these officials could conceivably be women.

--Also not included in the tabulation are what are called intermediate units, school districts operating in between the state departments of education and the local school districts. Superintendents of these units have no teachers or pupils, and function mainly as administrators of special services.

--In some cases, actual administrators of operating school districts aren't even included. An NEA study conducted in 1970-71 indicated that there were 12,849 superintendents in basic administrative units (ie, actually operating schools), while there were 17,896 school districts. The discrepancy between the two figures can be attributed to the fact that some districts are so small that they don't have superintendents per se. The administrators may be called supervisory principals, for example. Because they are titled differently, they aren't included in the tally.

This problem of nomenclature is compounded because district, division, city, and county are often synonymous--all referring to an operating school system. Also, in some states, the county

superintendent is a very responsible and powerful position of administration over several districts (as contrasted with the type of county clerk/superintendent mentioned earlier).

--There is also the problem of plain lack of information. Virginia Stevenson, chief of the research service at the American Association of School Administrators, an affiliate of the NEA, said she couldn't estimate the number of women district superintendents because there are no ongoing records for all the school districts. The AASA keeps active and up-to-date files on only 500-600 school districts with student populations of 12,000 or more. Of these, VS said one or two had women superintendents at last count.

VS maintains that the most recent NEA study treating the subject of women superintendents is totally innacurate. Titled "Research Report 1970-71 R-5: Biennial Salary Survey of Public School Professional Personnel," it states that there are 90 women out of a total of 14,379 central office administrators of school districts with the title of superintendent. According to VS, this is a weighted figure (i.e., an estimated national figure based on a sampling), and 90 is merely a projection. She added that the figure of 12,849 (see p.1) is the correct total for school district superintendents in 1970-71. It represents an actual count based on information from the state education departments. Since the departments do not furnish breakdowns by sex, VS says it is impossible to estimate from official figures the number of women among the total number of school district superintendents.

Although our statistic of 2 out of 13,000 was based on an independent NEA survey, not official figures, its reliability, even at the time it was taken, is questionable. I checked with the Georgia State Education Department and learned that the administrators of the 190 public school systems are variously called county, district or city superintendents. Possibly, the four women referred to in the letter were excluded from the NEA survey because they were county, not district, superintendents. What is even more probable is that they simply took office after 1967-68.

sb/
12/28/71

On the completion of undergraduate work, somewhat fewer women than men become candidates for the master's degree. The real problem, however, is at the doctoral level. Of all doctorates earned in the United States between 1960 and 1969, only 11.6 percent went to women and in many fields there were virtually no women at all gaining Ph.D.'s.

At the graduate professional level, the situation has been equally bleak. As recently as 1969, only about 16,000 of the approximately 166,000 enrolled in graduate professional schools were women. As a consequence, the representation of women in the professions today is extremely poor. For example, only 3.5 percent of lawyers, 2 percent of dentists, 7 percent of physicians and less than 1 percent of engineers are women. By contrast, in Sweden women make up 24 percent of the lawyers and in Denmark 70 percent of the dentists. In Britain 16 percent of the physicians are women, in France 13 percent; in Germany 20 percent; and in Israel 24 percent.

The problem here in the United States is not that women don't wish to be in employment. In fact, they now make up 37 percent of the entire labor force. But they are concentrated in clerical and service work and when at the professional or technical level, are found principally in just a few traditionally female occupations such as school teaching, social work and nursing. One cannot help but reflect on the talent loss to our society and impoverishment of it represented in this general exclusion of women from the professions due to their failure to gain the appropriate training.

Within higher education women apparently make up from one-fifth to one-quarter of the total teaching and professional staff. This figure is sometimes cited to show that there has been less

discrimination than alleged, but the problem is that women don't get their fair share of the rewards. They are seldom hired by major universities, even when they have done brilliant work earning Ph.D.'s at those institutions. As I have already indicated, they are heavily concentrated in the traditional female fields. They are found much more frequently at small colleges, at junior colleges, where they make up 40 percent of the faculty, and at institutions with lower prestige. When at universities, they tend to be in non-tenured, off-ladder, subprofessional positions, and if they are tenured, they are promoted less rapidly than men. Less than one-tenth of all women faculty are full professors, whereas about a quarter of the men hold that rank. Finally, women earn less than men, mainly because they are relegated to the lower status positions, but also in some institutions because they are simply paid less for equal work.

The American Council on Education reports that in 1969 63 percent of faculty women were paid less than $10,000 per year while only 28 percent of the men were in that category.

When we look at some of the better known institutions we find a deplorable situation. At Harvard, in 1969, with a total of 731 tenured faculty, only 11 members were women. Until very recently only two women held full professorships--one being a chair reserved specially for women (the figure has risen to 11 in just the past few weeks). At the University of Chicago in 1969, only 11 out of 575 full professors were women. At Berkeley, in 1970, only 2 percent of full professors, 5 percent of associate professors, and 5 percent of assistant professors were women. At Stanford and Columbia 2 percent of full professors were women. And so it goes, the situation being essentially no better at any other major institution.

In the top ranks of college and university admini-

stration, if one excepts the Catholic women's colleges, one has to look far and wide to find a woman. There are currently virtually no four-year coeducational institutions headed by a woman. Even among the nonsectarian women's colleges female presidents number just eight. There are only a few women deans, as opposed to deans of women. Of the 50 largest academic libraries not one is headed by a woman. Schools of social work, which a few decades ago had many woman deans, are now headed almost exclusively by men. Truly women are the marginal people of higher education, essential to its existence but often invisible.

Now, lest those of you here tonight who represent other levels of education are beginning to feel smug, let me cite a few statistics about <u>your</u> balliwick. Of the approximately 13,000 superintendents of school districts in the nation exactly 2 are women--2 out of 13,000! Men hold 78 percent of

See attached memo for explanation of this statement

the elementary school principalships and 96 percent of the high school principalships, although they constitute only 32 percent of the public elementary and secondary school teachers. Well, that doesn't look very good does it--especially when over the past decade women have been earning 13 percent of the doctorates in educational administration.

The Decline of Women Faculty

If we compare the participation of women in higher education today with the situation forty years ago we find, rather surprisingly, that it has considerably worsened. In 1930, 47 percent of undergraduates, as opposed to today's 38 percent, were women; 28 percent of the doctorates were won by women then as against today's 13 percent, and at many institutions the proportion of women faculty members was higher than today.

How do we explain this decline? How do we

explain the generally unsatisfactory state of affairs as regards the participation of women in higher education? There are some strident voices being heard nowadays which ascribe the situation purely and simply to male prejudice. It cannot be denied that there <u>is</u> discrimination against women in higher education, some of it blatent, some of it subtle. Some of you in this room, along with women everywhere, have suffered from it. Others here, along with men elsewhere, have practiced it, however unconscious you may have been of doing so. But to ascribe the present situation entirely to prejudice against women is simply ludicrous. It's a far more complicated matter than that.

Several hypotheses have been advanced to explain the decline in the proportion of women faculty--some economic, some related to overall trends in higher education, others more sociological or psychological in character. Certainly the

explanation is one for conjecture, not dogmatic assertion.

It has been argued that during the Depression, with jobs scarce, preference in hiring was quite naturally given to men. This seems plausible, but why did the decline of women faculty continue after the Depression ended?

It has been pointed out that the decline may be purely a statistical phenomenon. As higher education mushroomed in the fifties and sixties and the total supply of faculty increased enormously the number of women, while rising slowly, inevitably became a great deal smaller as a proportion of the total. Plausible too. But why didn't the number of women faculty rise as rapidly as the number of men?

It has been suggested that relative to other fields there was, after Sputnik, a great increase in the scientific and technological disciplines, which are also regarded as the more "masculine"

fields, thus creating a greater demand for men than women. It is certainly true that women are grossly underrepresented in most of the sciences and in engineering.

It has been claimed that the decline is a natural concomitant of the growth of attractive alternatives to college teaching for women--in retail trade, in journalism and in the professions. These occupations may have drawn a few women away, but opportunities elsewhere were certainly not so great as to account for the phenomenon alone.

It does seem that three possibly interrelated sets of circumstances accelerated the decline of women in academic life in the 1940's and 1950's. The first was the influx into higher education of massive numbers of G.I. Bill-financed World War II and Korean War veterans who were given preference in college and graduate school admissions at the expense of women.

The second and most dramatic happening in the 40's and 50's was what has been called "the headlong rush into maternity" by young women. After rejecting motherhood in the 30's, as indicated by the low national birthrate during that decade, they suddenly began to produce large families. This cultural transformation swept along many women who felt compelled to have children whether they really wanted them or not. A rapidly rising national birthrate coincided with the decline of the proportion of women faculty.

A third factor was a steady drying up during the two post-war decades of the nation's pool of domestic help as more and more women entered industry and as the country became more affluent. Women who might have considered professional careers were compelled to turn to housework instead.

Cultural and Psychological Factors

In aggregate, these several theories explain a good deal but somehow are not entirely satisfactory. For a fuller explanation one needs to consider some of the broader and deeper cultural and psychological factors that have generally limited the participation of women in higher education and in the professions. Here I must acknowledge a debt both to my female colleagues at Carnegie Corporation and to the writings of perceptive observers such as David Reisman, Ellen and Kenneth Keniston, Patricia Graham, and others.

Unquestionably, the problem starts very early for most women, probably at birth. Certainly by the time girls have reached age six they have been firmly directed by their parents, indeed by every influence in their lives, into a pattern of behavior associated with being "feminine" as opposed to being "masculine." They are expected to have different toys, play different games, dress differently, behave less boisterously, be less aggressive, and so on. In

school this expectation of "feminine" behavior and comportment is steadily reinforced and accentuated as the years go by and as various kinds of separate activities for boys and girls make their appearance. Furthermore, high school counselors often guide girls toward a few traditionally feminine fields where it is thought they will have the most opportunity and do best.

Very possibly some of this differentiation in the behavior patterns of boys and girls is rooted in fundamental physical, physiological, and at least assumed psychological differences. Nevertheless, the <u>degree</u> of differentiation, which itself rests on widely held attitudes about the respective roles of men and women in society, places women at an enormous disadvantage as they reach post-high school age and contemplate their future prospects. For by this time, they have acquired such a deeply ingrained view of themselves as homemakers and child bearers and the helpmates of men, that they find it virtually impossible psychologically to compete with men in any endeavor.

And what is perhaps even more injurious to females is the fact that boys by the end of high school have acquired a view of girls which forms the basis of a lifelong attitude of male superiority. Undoubtedly this attitude lies at the heart of much of the prejudice and discrimination against women who attempt to step out of the roles allotted to them and enter the so-called masculine fields.

The enormous force of the pervasive cultural context which determines the development of women in American life has, of course, a direct bearing on their participation in higher education. It blunts their motivation to aspire to high intellectual and professional achievement, accustoms them to have low expectations of themselves, and in the process offers to men the very evidence of female inferiority which the male ego finds so necessary to sustain itself. How maddening this must be for women!

A great many women contemplating careers in higher education or other professions experience sharp and distressing feelings of inner conflict. They are caught between the pressures and impulses that lead them toward the "feminine mystique" of homemaking and child-rearing and the attractions and satisfactions inherent in teaching and creative scholarship or in the intellectual challenge of the higher professions. These inner doubts compel them to question whether they have the courage and the stamina to try to do both--combine motherhood and a career. Often the outcome is an uneasy settling for one or the other.

The sense of ambivalence in women becomes most acute in the years of the early to mid-twenties--the very years when young people are expected to devote themselves intensively to preparation for a career. For many women, however, these are the years when they are most vulnerable to fears that successful competition against men will make them seem less

feminine, will cause them to be unpopular, and will cost them their chance of marriage and children. Such fears and apprehensions may well be at odds with a full-scale commitment to serious study.

The problem is not eased by the fact that young women who look around for models to emulate see few women occupying positions of importance in the professional world, and those that there are often unmarried. If a young woman wants to marry, bear children and also have a responsible position, where will she find the example to pattern herself by? And who will give her the understanding and wise counsel she needs? Not the typical male faculty member, I can assure you. Not always perhaps even the rare woman who is to be found in the upper ranks of the academy or professional practice. Having made it herself by enduring the personal sacrifices necessary to compete with men and beat them at their own game,

she may have little compassion for the doubts and hesitations of younger women.

Barriers to the Advancement of Women

Based on the underlying cultural and psychological factors I have just been discussing, a formidable array of barriers to the advancement of women has been erected by the academic society. Some women feel that these barriers have been put up consciously and deliberately by men, and in some cases they have. More often, however, they are the unconscious products of ignorance, insensitivity, unconcern--and fear--on the part of men, all springing from their traditional set of assumptions and beliefs about women.

Many of these assumptions and beliefs affect the attitude of men toward women doctorates and form the basis for bias in hiring and promotion. Some of these have in them an element of truth, but most are pure folklore. One might have expected more rationality and respect for evidence in the academy of all places.

It is, for example, commonly held that women, however capable and talented, will terminate their careers when they marry and have children. Recent studies, however, cast doubt on that contention. Helen Astin, investigating what happened to all women who received doctorates in 1957 and 1958 during the eight subsequent years, found that only 55 percent were married, as opposed to 86 percent of women in the general population. She found also that twice as many women Ph.D.'s as women in general were childless and that those with children had small families. Furthermore, the time taken off from their careers for childbearing was a matter of months, not years.

Most significantly, Dr. Astin found that 91 percent of the 1957 and 1958 doctorates were still in the labor force eight years later, 81 percent working full-time. Seventy-nine percent had not once interrupted their careers in that time. About half the women had remained with the same employers since getting their degree, and another 30 percent had changed jobs only once. These

mobility rates are comparable with the rates for men.

Women are said to be less productive than men in the publication of scholarly books and articles. Here the evidence is inconclusive. Certainly women do publish. Seventy-five percent of the women studied by Dr. Astin had published something and 10 percent had published a considerable amount. Another study indicates that married women Ph.D.s actually publish slightly more than male Ph.D.'s. The fact remains, however, that the majority of all women faculty are in institutions where the teaching loads are heavy and where the pressure and opportunity to publish are less.

It is thought that women are not as academically competent or well-qualified as men, but several studies indicate just the opposite. They show that women Ph.D.'s have somewhat greater academic ability than their male counterparts, judging by tests of aptitude and achievement. It is said that women do not attract graduate students and other colleagues

who could enhance the prestige of the institution. Nor do they have the visibility of men, who are much more likely to have outside consulting work or activities that may bring favorable publicity or funding to the institution or both. No doubt there is some truth in this, although it seems an unfair set of charges to bring against women, as it could equally well be brought against many men.

Other charges strike one as equally unfair and unworthy of those who make them. Women are said to lack the drive and tenacity to undertake the demanding, time-consuming preparation needed for a successful academic career. They are said to be less innovative than men. They lack credibility as serious scholars and professionals. They are less authoritative and convincing in their lectures. They don't look the part; their physical appearance--their sex--distracts and detracts. A large number of women in a department will lower its prestige and

that of the institution. Lots of women around will spoil the atmosphere of the faculty club. And so on ad infinitim.

You have heard all these claims and you know they are mostly fantasy or pure invention trotted out by the male academic simply to cover up his deep-seated aversion to having women as equal colleagues, as competitors and possibly even as superiors. The fact is that higher education has been institutionalized on a male basis, and the introduction of women into its positions of power upsets the system and causes difficulties. For this reason rationalizations must be found to keep women out.

Another barrier to women related to the predominently masculine character of higher education is the existence of a faculty recruitment system predicated on the assumption that only males are to be hired. Most male faculty members belong to a communications network which con-

sists of senior men in their discipline they once worked with or junior men who have worked for them, or both. The network also consists of men they get to know at meetings of their professional societies and academic associations, and with whom they knock back that bottle of bourbon in late hour, hotel room bull sessions. Finally, it consists of men with whom they serve on government committees and advisory panels whom they frequently meet in all male clubs. It isn't hard to see that women just don't get recommended for the better jobs through this system. They don't even hear about them.

There are other barriers to women of a more readily identifiable kind. One, which fortunately is beginning to disappear, is the nepotism rule. Where husband and wife are equally well-qualified it has almost always been the wife who was excluded, or through some circumvention of the rules, forced to take a low-status nontenured job--at lower pay,

of course, and often without fringe benefits.

On some campuses wives of faculty members have been able to get maternity coverage on their health insurance, but women faculty members have not. In other places women cannot use sick leave for childbirth, the rationale being that it is not an illness and, therefore, should not be covered in the same way as other temporary disabilities.

Still another barrier to the academic woman is the rule on many campuses against part-time status, either as graduate student or faculty member. For the married women with young children this, of course, creates an almost insuperable deterrent. A few courageous women manage to play the roles of wife, mother of young children, and full-time scholar simultaneously, but the psychic and physical costs are great.

Finally, having triumphed against great diffi-

culties to have a career of teaching and scholarship the academic woman, on reaching retirement, discovers that she has yet another bitter experience in store for her, if she has her pension, as most do, with TIAA. She finds that she will receive a significantly lower monthly annuity than her male colleagues. The reason for this is that the difference in life expectancy between sexes is considerable--more than six years greater for women at age 65. Nevertheless, reasons the women annuitant, how can I be sure I will be one of those who reaches the expected age? And what about other factors which affect life expectancy, such as race, economic status, health, smoking and alcohol. Why shouldn't these factors be taken into account if sex is?

The Woman's College

No discussion of women in higher education could be complete without some reference to the traditional women's colleges. Founded mainly in the half century following the Civil War and,

except for the Catholic colleges, largely a phenomenon of the northeastern and southern parts of the country, they offered higher educational opportunity for women in two areas where little other opportunity existed for them. The flavor of these institutions in their earlier days is well illustrated by the following excerpts from Mt. Holyoke College regulations of the 1840's:

> "No student shall devote more than one hour each week to miscellaneous reading. The Atlantic Monthly, Shakespeare, Scott's novels, Robinson Crusoe and immoral works are strictly forbidden."
>
> "No student may have male acquaintances unless they are retired missionaries or agents of benevolent societies."
>
> and, "no student shall tarry before a mirror more than three consecutive minutes."

I sometimes think in regard to today's college students that perhaps tarrying before a mirror should be compulsory. But that's another issue!

Always concerned with their in loco parentis role, some women's colleges never became much more than genteel finishing schools for the daughters of the well-to-do, while others achieved high intellectual distinction. With largely female faculties and frequently a female president, they offered careers in higher education for some exceptionally able women who might not have found them elsewhere. In the Northeast, until quite recently, the families which were likely to send their sons to an Ivy League college were equally likely to send their daughters to one of the Seven Sisters colleges, which were considered academically comparable in virtually every respect.

Within the past two to three decades there seems to have been a considerable change of outlook in the women's colleges, in which they have sought to diminish and dilute their character as all female institutions. Many colleges began to hire

male faculty in numbers and to appoint male presidents twenty to thirty years ago and finally within the past few years to admit men students. Perhaps some of the women's colleges were anachronistic, perhaps they felt somewhat old-fashioned, perhaps the move to coeducation was good for them. But, in my opinion, it would be a great pity if all women's colleges felt they had to follow this path. Both at the faculty and student levels there will undoubtedly continue to be some women for whom the separate sex college provides the most congenial social atmosphere and the best teaching and learning environment. To this degree these colleges provide an important part of the diversity which is one of higher education's greatest strengths in this country. I am happy to note that a number of women's colleges, including Smith, Mt. Holyoke and Wheaton in Massachusetts, have all recently decided not to go coeducational.

Coercive Government Action

I have said that government at all levels is becoming steadily more involved in the protection of women's rights. At the federal level the action in higher education thus far has come under a 1968 Presidential Executive Order which forbids discrimination by federal contractors on grounds of sex. Responsibility for enforcement of the Order in regard to all contracts between the federal government and higher educational institutions lies with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Under the Order, individuals and women's groups have filed more than 350 formal charges of sex discrimination against various institutions and systems, including Columbia University, the Universities of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan and Massachusetts, the City University of New York and the entire state systems of Florida, California and New Jersey.

At the present time the Executive Order is the only recourse women have. It is, however, an administrative remedy and does not have the status of law. It can be suspended or amended at the pleasure of the President. Use of the Executive Order has come under fire from both sides. Campus administrators find HEW's investigative procedures clumsy and irritating. They complain of peremptory orders to file affirmative action plans without any clear indication of what kinds of standards are expected of their institutions.

Women's organizations, on the other hand, find HEW's procedures lengthy, complicated and frustrating. They claim it often takes months for officials to investigate charges, and when they do, they do so inadequately and fail to consult local women's groups. They charge, furthermore, that HEW issues conflicting statements about whether or not contract funds are being withheld.

Nonetheless, some real action has resulted from enforcement of the Executive Order. For example, some $7.5 million of contract funds were withheld from the University of Michigan until it came up with an acceptable plan to end sex discrimination and the University agreed to pay women about $6 million of back pay, retroactive to 1968, to make up for past salary inequities.

Various other governmental remedies are under active consideration in Washington. The two that have received the most attention are Title X of H. R. 7248, the Green Bill, and the proposed Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution. The former, which was passed by the House of Representatives November 5th, contains provisions which would have far-reaching effects in regard to discrimination against women in <u>all</u> levels of education.

It provides that, "no person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from

participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." Exceptions are admissions policies for all undergraduate institutions, religious institutions whose tenets interfere with the purposes of the Act, and institutions formerly of one sex but in the process of becoming coeducational, which are given seven years from the dates they started the process to complete the transition.

Title X would also extend Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which forbids discrimination in employment, specifically to cover faculty in educational institutions. This, of course, would not imply parity in the numbers of men and women employed, because the pool of women available and applying for jobs will always be smaller than that of men. Finally, the Bill would amend the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to include executive, profes-

sional and administrative employees and therefore such employees at all levels of education.

The Equal Rights Amendment, which has been around for a long time, having been introduced in every session of Congress since 1923, has been passed again recently by the House of Representatives. If passed by the Senate and eventually ratified by the required number of states, it would totally bar discrimination against women at all levels of education. There are many who prefer the Equal Rights Amendment to other approaches, but its chances of passage by the Senate in anything but a watered-down version seem very slim. For the present, therefore, the anti-discrimination features of the Green Bill, if incorporated in the final version of the higher education act, are the strongest hope for those who seek a basis in law for their opposition to bias in higher education.

Personally, I regret that it has become necessary, because of intransigence, or at least

lack of perceptiveness, on the part of higher education, for government to take coercive action under the Executive Order and to be considering it in the Green Bill. Measures such as these seem to me to constitute an invasion of campus autonomy and an abridgement of academic freedom. On the other hand, government has a basic obligation to protect the rights of its citizens - yes, even women - and without the threat of coercion it seems unlikely higher education would have budged an inch on the issue. Certainly it had every chance to do so and failed.

It is particularly unfortunate that we have reached this state of affairs because, as I have tried to suggest, bias per se is only part of the problem. Even if it is removed, there will still remain a great deal to be done. The real problem is not simply the <u>prevention</u> of discrimination against women but the <u>promotion</u> of their fuller participation in all aspects of higher education.

Let me suggest an analogy. The removal of legal barriers against the admission of Blacks to formerly all white colleges and universities was enormously important but did not automatically result either in their entry in sufficient numbers or success there. That has been a long, slow process requiring a multiplicity of supportive actions and, of course, some fundamental changes of attitude. And so it will be with women.

Non-coercive Measures

What, then, needs to be done to achieve the fuller participation of women? There are things colleges and universities can do. There are things government can do. There are things lower levels of education can do, and there are things society at large can do. Some of these actions are quite simple and inexpensive, others difficult and costly. The most difficult involve basic attitude changes.

Within higher education itself there must now be a firm institutional commitment on the part of colleges and universities to get on with the job rapidly and in a forthright manner. This should start by each institution, if it has not already done so, making a thorough study of its policies and attitudes as they affect women and drawing up its own affirmative action plan and procedures to implement it. No institution should wait until this is forced upon it. It should take the initiative now, not as a defensive action but with the positive spirit that it is something right and desirable to do.

As institutions draw up their plans, they will discuss a wide range of specific steps that can be taken to increase participation of women. Many of these are well known and are already being tried on some campuses. They include such things as a thorough inventory of the campus community and its

environs to discover what resources of trained women may be available for appointment or promotion; the revision of nepotism rules; the authorization of maternity leaves for women faculty members and administrators - leaves that are covered by health insurance; the guaranty of job reservation for women taking maternity leave and postponement of tenure decisions by the length of the leave; the revision of rules to permit the granting of tenure to those in part time employment; the provision of fringe benefits, or compensation in lieu thereof, for part-time employees; and finally, the inauguration, where possible, of continuing education programs through which women who have had to break off their education at an earlier stage of their lives can take it up again and prepare for delayed careers.

More controversial policies, are the provision of day care centers and

paternity leaves to fathers. Underlying the latter notion is a new belief on the part of many young people that husbands should share equally with their wives the responsibility for child rearing so that the wives will be at no disadvantage in having careers.

Generally, more women should be appointed to committees of all kinds, to academic councils and senates and to boards of trustees. Within departments specific plans should be developed for the recruitment, hiring, and promotion of women, aimed at reasonable goals. In some fields, such as physics and engineering, this will, of course, be exceptionally difficult, so, on an institutional basis, goals will have to be flexible. It ought not to be necessary, and would probably be undesirable, to set quotas for the employment of women. The need is for goals and appropriate procedures to ensure good faith effort to reach them.

In meeting their institutional commitment to increase the proportion of women faculty, colleges and universities may find they have to abridge somewhat traditional departmental autonomy. If the matter is left entirely to departments, the effort will certainly be uneven. It may, for example, be necessary to place under centralized authority some funds over which departments would normally exercise control. Or it may be necessary to insist that before any appointment is made a department must produce a list of the women who were considered for the post and the reasons in each case why they were rejected.

Although admission to undergraduate institutions was excepted from the provisions of Title X of the Green Bill, it seems obvious to me that a situation which permits discrimination against women at that level cannot long survive. Those places which purport to be coeducational but have a quota system

favoring men have, probably, at best, simply gained a bit of turn-around time. The transition to a fully non-discriminatory policy will, of course, be painful. It will produce something approaching parity of male and female enrollments, which will mean simply that either fewer men can be admitted or the size of the undergraduate body must be expanded to accommodate the extra women.

Some institutions will look to the three-year degree as a way of solving the problem of additional places without additional construction. Others may see equality in admissions as an opportunity to raise the overall quality of their undergraduate bodies. Private institutions which worry about the effect later on their income of having fewer male graduates may not have considered the countervailing effect of having women graduates in the future earning high salaries in top level executive and professional jobs. If women are to have equality

of opportunity and equality of rewards, they must take their fair share of responsibility for alumni giving.

At the graduate and professional school level, the idea of parity of enrollments is, clearly, quite unrealistic. Even if substantial efforts are made to encourage more women to take post-baccalaureate training, and in a much wider selection of fields, there will still be a considerably smaller pool of women to draw on. This is so because many women by that time will have decided against careers in favor of marriage and child rearing. Here, as in the hiring of women faculty, reasonable goals, good faith effort at recruitment, and total fairness in the selection process should be adequate.

The role of government, it seems to me, should not be limited simply to one of devising and applying coercive measures. It should recognize that we are in the present position not entirely, perhaps not even essentially, because anyone is

guilty of wrongdoing but because we have all been prisoners of age-old mores and cultural attitudes. Government should, therefore, especially in view of the present financial crisis in higher education, consider a program of constructive inducements--grants in plain language--to help institutions increase the participation of women in higher education.

I have said that the roots of the unequal treatment of women lie in early childhood. What is done in the schools may, therefore, ultimately be more important than anything done in higher education. I would, consequently, urge everyone involved in pre-school, elementary and secondary education to examine carefully all aspects of their work to see how unnnecessary forms of early sex stereotyping can be eliminated. It goes without saying that vigorous efforts should also be made to see that women get a fairer share of the top administrative posts in public education.

In closing, I would like to make it very clear that nothing I have said this evening is intended to suggest even the slightest lack of regard for the traditional woman's role of child-rearing, homemaking and voluntary community service. Many women will want to choose this path and should--with the highest respect accorded to them by all of us, including women who do not choose this path.

What I have said is that women who have the ability and desire for careers in education and the professions should be given a fair chance to have them and that a fair chance, because of the accumulated negative impact of our cultural heritage, includes active encouragement and assistance to women--especially those who want to combine marriage and child-rearing with a career. It seems to me this issue comes down

basically to a matter of human justice. I hope all of you here will agree with me that until we have righted the wrong done to women in our society, the promise of American democracy will remain unfulfilled.

I am grateful to you for hearing me out at such length.

AP:hca
11/26/71